

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 23 continue to be in the case.

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract should be in a single paragraph and the recitations "Fig. 1" and "(23 claims)" recited at the bottom of the abstract should be deleted . Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01 (b).

A revised Abstract of the Disclosure is attached to this Amendment.

10790323

3. Claims 3-8 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 3-8 and 21, the recitation "the said...." sounds awkward. It is suggested it should be read as - said -.

Applicant amends claims 3 to 6 and 21 in this amendment.

4. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Poland on December 5, 2003. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 363901 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Applicant very much appreciates the kind reminder regarding the missing certified copy of the priority document. However the applicant's attorney has mailed the priority document "POLAND Application No. P-363901, Filing date December 5, 2003" together with a claim for priority to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on or about May 25, 22004. A Return Postcard indicates that the Priority Document was received on May 28,2004 by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

11. Claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10790323

Applicant very much appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter for claim 7. Claim 7 has been amended to place it in fully allowable form.

12. Claims 11 and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant very much appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter for claims 11 and 23. Claims 11 and 23 have been amended to place them in fully allowable form.

Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

All claims as presently submitted are deemed to be in form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrycjusz Konsun

By:



Horst M. Kasper, his attorney,
13 Forest Drive, Warren, N.J. 07059
Tel.:(908)526-1717 Fax:(908)526-6977
Reg. No. 28,559; Docket No.: LAC201